In this study I have tried to demonstrate that the employees of Oriental, as employees, were members in three systems of relationships postulated in the first chapter — the formal, the institutional and the informal systems. The institutional and informal relationships made differentiation within formal groups and categories and alliances across them. The memberships of an employee in the institutional and the informal systems gave new meanings to his perception of his membership in the formal system. Moreover, we have seen that the working of the formal system threw up a chain of dissatisfaction among employees for the Management, and that these dissatisfaction were "explained away" by the working of the institutional and the informal systems. To this extent, the institutional and informal systems served to cushion the social antagonisms implicit in the formal system.

However, the acceptance of the values of the institutional and informal systems did not supersede or upset the values of the formal system. The employees of Oriental accepted the values of all the three systems. They were interested in maintaining and, if possible, raising their statuses in all the systems; in fact the statuses in the different systems were interrelated. Employees wanted to be good members of all the systems. They therefore wanted to
conform to all the three sets of norms. From a broader perspective, taking the formal norms as symbolising the industrial society and the institutional and informal norms the non-industrial society, we can say that the norms of the industrial and non-industrial societies coexisted. This coexistence may be a reflection of a similar coexistence of norms obtaining in the society outside the factory.

It follows from the above hypothesis, in the context of the problem formulated in the beginning, that in the present case modern technology did not altogether destroy the traditional society and culture, though it modified them. (The modification is evident in the very fact that the employees participated in the formal system). The traditional society and culture (embodied in the institutional and informal systems) set certain standards by which employees looked at and accepted technology. Technology, therefore, got modified as a result of the participation of people in it. That is to say, as a result of their interaction, both technology and the traditional society modified each other. This made them compatible with each other and coexistent. If this is true, then we can say that it may not be always necessary for the western society and culture to follow western technology.

* * * * *

There are, as Gouldner (1955: p.9) has pointed out, a number of ways in which data gathered in a factory can be
arranged and presented. Conceiving a factory as a social system comprising formal, institutional and informal systems (as I have done for Oriental) is one of these ways. Most studies in industrial sociology in the west have made the dichotomy of formal and informal relationships (which originated in the Hawthorne study of Roethlisberger and his colleagues) their starting-point. It would have been possible for me to include both the institutional and the informal systems in this study under "informal relationships". But my experience with Oriental made it clear that the institutional alliances of the employees were clearly distinguishable from the informal bonds they developed within the factory and hence needed a separate treatment.

Corresponding to the emphasis on the formal-informal dichotomy in industrial sociology in the west, there has been an excessive preoccupation with problems of productivity. Productivity, in fact, appears to be the foundation of industrial sociology there. To my mind, the questions of productivity involve certain values which rest on numerous historical and economic assumptions (stability of market, availability of raw-materials etc.). I have, therefore, kept the problem of productivity away from the present study.

I must repeat that I have used the term institutional system in a very narrow sense. In Oriental I just tumbled on language, caste and kinship affiliations. One or more of these affiliations may be absent in other factories and some other institutional affiliations (local communities,
religion etc.) may be in the forefront. The institutional systems of factories in India seem to differ according to the location of a factory and the social composition of its region.

In presenting this study, I have kept in mind, as far as I could, the conceptualization of the factory as a social system and tried to show how the formal, institutional and informal systems interacted or were interdependent. However, I have had another equally strong motive in respect of this study - to describe the working of an Indian factory from the sociologist's eye-glasses. Since, in my knowledge, such a study of a factory has not been done in India before, I should think that even a simple sociography can be a contribution to knowledge. For this reason, I have made what can be regarded as long digressions from the main theme at some places in this essay. Such digressions occur particularly in Chapter II (where I have attempted to give a social history of Rajnagar), in Chapter IV (where the emergence of factory population in Rajnagar is elaborately discussed) and in Chapter VII (which contains a history of trade unionism in Oriental).